



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

cen

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/701,705	12/01/2000	Yukihiko Okumura	15689.61	7195

7590 06/13/2007
 ADRIAN J. LEE
 WORKMAN, NYDEGGER & SEELEY
 1000 EAST GATE TOWER
 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

GHULAMALI, QUTBUDDIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/13/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

OK

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/701,705	Applicant(s) OKUMURA ET AL.	
	Examiner Qutub Ghulamali	Art Unit 2611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.
- 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6, 8, 18-20, 22, 23, 33-37, 47, 49 and 53-85 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1-6, 8, 18-20, 22, 23, 33-37, 47, 49, 53-61, 64-77 and 80-85 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 62 and 78 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 63 and 79 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 - 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the Remarks/Amendment filed on 03/16/2007.

Response to Remarks/Amendments

2. Applicant's amendment to claims 1, 2, 4 and 8 is acknowledged.
3. Applicant's amendment of claim 69 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph regarding antecedence of "the pilot signals" which is now amended to read "pilot signals".
4. The objection to claim 69 is withdrawn in view of the explanation provided Applicant regarding "N sets of the data sequences" (remarks page 30)
5. Applicant's remark with respect to claim 78 has been fully considered but is moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The rejection based on the new art follows.
6. The rejection of claims 7 and 51 is moot. Claims 7 and 50-52 stand cancelled filed 03/16/2007.

Claim Objections

7. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:
Claim 1, second last line, a typographical error in the amendment, shows "leaning" as deleted. It should be reinstated in the claim.
Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 62 and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seki et al (USP 6,304,624) in view of Sun (USP 6,295,311).

Regarding claim 78, Seki discloses a demodulation and channel estimation method comprising:

weighting and averaging pilot signals using a plurality of weight sequences (weight factors W_a , W_b), to obtain a plurality of channel estimation values (col. 1, lines 45-55; col. 2, lines 19-43; col. 16, lines 51-65);

deriving a plurality of demodulated data sequences from a data sequence using said plurality of channel estimation values (col. 4, lines 33-44; col. 14, lines 26-32, 47-53).

Seki does not explicitly disclose making judgment of reliability of a plurality of demodulated data. However, Sun in a similar field of endeavor discloses selecting one output data sequence by making judgment of reliability of a plurality of demodulated data (fig. 3, elements 42, 56, 62, 64, 66, 68; col. 4, lines 35-54; col. 5, lines 23-27, 35-40, 55-67; col. 6, lines 1-7). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize making judgment of reliability of a plurality of demodulated data with selecting an output data sequence as taught by Sun in the

system of Seki because the advantage gained by the teaching can result in further improvements of data symbols measure of reliability.

As per claim 62, the steps claimed as apparatus is nothing more than restating the function of the specific components of the method steps as claimed above and therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method as taught by the combined art of Seki and Sun because it can allow insertion of pilot symbols to estimate channel response of data symbols in a fading environment to mitigate noise and multi interference and improve estimation accuracy.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claim 1-2 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the objection(s) set forth in this Office action.
11. Claims 4-6, 8, 18-20, 22, 23, 33-37, 47, 49, 53-61, 64-77, 80-85 allowed.
12. Claims 63 and 79 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2611

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Qutub Ghulamali whose telephone number is (571) 272-3014. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ghayour can be reached on (571) 272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2611

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

QG.
June 6, 2007.


MOHAMMED GHAYOUR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
